

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,343	(	05/07/2001	Juergen Roemisch	06478.1455	1124
22852	7590	09/26/2003			
· ·	HEND	ERSON, FAR	EXAMINER		
LLP 1300 I STREE WASHINGTO	-	20005	HUYNH, PHUONG N		
WASHINGIC	M, DC	20003		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1644	
			DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/849,343	ROEMISCH ET AL.	
Advisory Addion	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuong Huynh	1644	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RI	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing dat			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 27(6)	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.
706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period (fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) _ they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim:	s.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s): See Continuation Sheet.		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se	reconsideration has been conside Continuation Sheet.	dered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			ind an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: 14-16.			
Claim(s) objected to: <i>None</i> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9 and 17</u> .			

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>10-13</u>.

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

## Continuation Sh t (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The objection to the specification for not contain antecedent support for "more than 1.5 g/ml" is hereby withdrawn in view of the support in paragraph 6, lines 1-6 of specification. Further, the rejections of claims 1-6, 8, 14-15 and 17 under 35 USC 103(a) as well as claims 7, 9 and 16 under 35 USC 103(a) are hereby withdrawn in view of the fact that the '940 patent is not prior art and co-owned by Aventis Behring GmbH as evidenced by the attached assingment records.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but not found convincing for the same reasons set forth in paper No 10. Applicants argue that claim 1 previously has been amended to recite that the composition comprises "more than 0.5 mol/g of each of two or more amino acids chosen from arginine, lysine, histidine, phenylalanine, tryptophan, tyrosine, aspartic acid and its salts and glutamic acid and its salts; wherein one of said amino acids is glutamate". The 717 composition is limited to "in the ranged of about 0.05M to about 0.8M". However, the term "about" in the reference expands the reference range to include 1.01 M or 1.01 mol/g of at least one amino acids selected from the group consisting of amino acid such as arginine, lysine, phenylalanine, tryptophan, aspartic acid, glutamic acid and its salt (glutamate) in the reference composition. (see column 5, lines 36-38, in particular). Applicants further argue that unlike in the '717 patent, the claimed compositions in claim 1 require that one of the chosen amino acids must be glutamate. However, the '717 patent also teaches the salt of the aforesaid amino acid, such as glutamate which is the salt of glutamic acid (See column 5, lines 27-28). Thus the techings of the '717 patent anticipates the claimed invention. On page 8 of the amendment, Applicants argue that the '757 patent does not remedy the deficiency of the '717 patent. One of ordianry skill in the art looking at these two patents, would have no desire to select glutamate as a necessary component in his compositions. Further, Applicants' claims require "two or more" amino acids. The '717 patent suggest no particular advatnage in using more than one amino acid. In contrast to Applicants' assertion that the '717 patent does not teach glutamate, the '717 patent teaches the salt of reference glutamic acid, which is glutamate (see column 5, line 27-28, in particular). The claimed "two or more amino acids" is an obvious variation of the references teaching since the '717 patent teaches a mixture of amino acids selected from the group consisting of arginine, lysine, phenylalanine, tryptophan, aspartic acid, glutamic acid and its salt and preferably at least one arginine for stabilized protein prearation against loss of activity during pasteurization (See column 5. lines 5-39 of '717 patent, in particular). The '757 patent teaches that one may use "amino acids" in a stablized protein preparation to protect against a loss of activity during pasteurization such a glycine and the salt of calcium (CaCl2). The motivation to combine can arise from the expectation that the prior art elements will perform their expected functions to achieve their expected results when combine for their common known purpose. Section MPEP 2144.07. For these reasons, the 102 (b) and the first 103(a) rejections remain.

CHRISTINA CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600